

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the:
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

Lawrence Y D Ho & Associates PTE LTD
30 Bideford Road
#07-01 Thongsa Building
Singapore 229922

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	08 APR 2005
Applicant's or agent's file reference 1237P006PCTj		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/SG2005/000054	International filing date (day/month/year) 24 February 2005	Priority date (day/month/year) 13 April 2004	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC Int. Cl. 7 E06B 3/82, 3/70, 3/988, B21D 39/02			
Applicant MALAYSIA WOODWORKING (PTE) LTD et al			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AU AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE PO BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AUSTRALIA E-mail address: pct@ipaaustralia.gov.au Facsimile No. (02) 6285 3929	Authorized Officer LEOPOLD FILIPOVIC Telephone No. (02) 6283 2105
---	---

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SG2005/000054

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
 a sequence listing
 table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
 in written format
 in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 contained in the international application as filed.
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SG2005/000054

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
-----------	--

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 4, 6, 8, 11, 13 and 19-23	YES
	Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14-18	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	YES
	Claims 1-23	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-23	YES
	Claims	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The documents cited in the International Search Report have been considered for the purpose of this opinion.

EP 405675 which is considered to be the most relevant prior art document discloses all the feature of the invention defined by claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14-16 and 18 (see the description at column 1, line 45- column 4, line 40 and figure 3). The citation relates to a door composed of interlockable building panels 13 and 16, the panels being provided with profiled edges, a tight fit between the profile edges being obtained through the use of rubber strips 19 and 20 stuck in the at least one channel formed by the profile edges.

The invention defined by claims 14 -18 is also considered not to be novel when compared with DE 3520500, WO 1982/004281 and DE 2351708. Each of these documents teaches the use of a metal structure provided with two sheet members having profiled edges forming at least one channel, a tight fit between the profile edges being obtained only after a locking means is obtained (see the locking engagement between the free edges 12 and 13 of DE 3520500; the locking connecting elements 6 and 7, figures 6-8, of WO 1982/004281 and a tight fit obtained as a result of welding as shown by DE 2351708). Please note that claims 14 -18 do not define the feature of applying the locking means into the at least one channel.

Therefore the subject matter of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14-18 is not new and does not meet the requirements of Article 33(2) PCT with regard to novelty.

The features added by claims 4, 6, 8, 11, 13 and 19-23 lie within the technical capabilities of the person skilled in the art and therefore the subject matter of these claims is obvious and does not meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT with regard to inventive step.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/SG2005/000054

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Claim 14 is not fairly based on what is described in the specification because it omits the feature of applying the at least one locking means into the at least one channel which appears to be essential to the invention.